

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 935

JC 720 167

TITLE Community and Junior Colleges in Transition: Fourth and Final Report on the Program With Developing Institutions.

INSTITUTION American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C. Program with Developing Institutions.

REPORT NO P-19

PUB DATE Jun 72

NOTE 39p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS Cooperative Programs; *Developmental Programs; Educational Development; *Educational Improvement; *Federal Programs; *Junior Colleges; Professional Associations; *Program Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This report on the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions (PWDI) summarizes the evolution and activities of the program with special emphasis on 1971-72, the fourth and final year of operation. Evaluations of the program by the participating colleges are included, and where possible, compared to corresponding evaluations of past years. Other aspects of the PWDI discussed are: (1) the national workshops on the low-income student and career curriculum building; (2) publications; (3) services to associate colleges; (4) regional activities; (5) college comments; and (6) campus activities evaluated by the colleges. Some conclusions regarding the significance of the PWDI are that it has: (1) assisted 200 colleges in adopting successful innovations; (2) demonstrated the value of using a non-profit educational association as an assisting agency for a federal program; (3) provided a bridge between the Office of Education and the colleges; (4) promoted the organization of regional consortia; and (5) been useful to AAJC by building communications with colleges and publicizing its resources. (RN)

ED 063935

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TRANSITION

Fourth and Final Report

on the

Program With Developing Institutions

PWDI

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 9 1972

A Joint Venture

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

of the

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

and

The United States Office of Education

AAJC Program With Developing Institutions

One Dupont Circle #410

Washington, D.C. 20036

Publication #19

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

June 30, 1972

JL 720 167

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TRANSITION

I N T R O D U C T I O N

After four and a quarter years of operation as a joint venture of the American Association of Junior Colleges and the U.S. Office of Education, the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions came to an end on June 30, 1972. This fourth and final report on the Program covers the fourth year, in the perspective of the total four-year program.

PWDI was set up as a crash program, early in 1968, aimed at assisting 85 junior and community colleges that had applied for Title III aid (Strengthening Developing Institutions) under the Higher Education Act of 1965, but whose applications showed that they needed help in planning for the future. Accordingly, the main emphasis that year was on "Planning for Development." In successive years the emphasis changed, but program planning and faculty development were always important ingredients. Administratively, the program was decentralized, to throw more and more of the decision-making to the regional coordinators and individual colleges, with the Washington AAJC/PWDI office doing less central coordination, and acting more as an advisory and assisting agency.

When the Title III awards were announced in May, 1971, for the year 1971-72, Dr. Willa Player, Director of the Division of College Support at the U.S. Office of Education, sent to the American Association of Junior Colleges a letter expressing appreciation for the manner in which the Program With Developing Institutions had largely met its original objectives, and stating that 1971-72 would be the final year of the program as a joint effort of USOE and AAJC, underwritten by Title III grants to junior colleges.

This report briefly summarizes the program as a whole, and how it evolved over a four-year period; and it records in more detail the fourth and last year of operation, comparing the colleges' evaluation of various segments of the program with corresponding evaluations in past years wherever possible. We have attempted to be completely accountable to the colleges we were serving each year; this report is our fourth and final effort to record the activities of the program and how they were evaluated by member colleges.

Special thanks are due to Helen Minifie for her assistance in assembling data on this year's program and helping to prepare this report for publication.

Although the American Association of Junior Colleges administered the Program With Developing Institutions, it was financed by funds from grants to colleges under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, through the Division of College Support, Bureau of Higher Education, U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

June 30, 1972

2

Selden Menefee
Program Director, AAJC/PWDI

On July 1, 1972 the name of the American Association of Junior Colleges will be changed to the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

COMMUNITY AND JUNIOR COLLEGES IN TRANSITION

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Introduction	i
Table of Contents	iii
I. Four Years of the Program in Perspective	1
II. General Evaluation of the 1971-72 Program	4
III. National PWDI Workshops	6
(1) The Low-Income Student	
(2) Career Curriculum Building	
IV. Reports of Regional Activities	10
(1) Reports of Coordinators	
(2) Regional Workshops	
V. Publications	17
(1) Newsletter	
(2) Other Publications	
VI. Campus Activities Evaluated by Colleges	19
(1) Local workshops	
(2) Inter-Campus Visits	
(3) Professional Meetings	
(4) Consultants' Visits	
VII. College Comments	21
VIII. Services to Associate Colleges	32
IX. Conclusions	33
Appendix A: List of Funded Colleges funded in PWDI, 1971-72 . .	34
Appendix B: Evaluation-Questionnaire and Results	35
Appendix C: Expenditure of PWDI funds in 1971-72 (as of May 31, 1972)	36

I. FOUR YEARS OF THE PROGRAM IN PERSPECTIVE

In January, 1968, officials of the Division of College Support, U.S. Office of Education, suggested to the American Association of Junior Colleges that it devise a program to assist developing junior colleges in formulating more clearly their objectives and their plans for the future, in order that they might better be able to qualify for aid under Title III of the Higher Education Act (Strengthening Developing Institutions).

AAJC moved quickly to meet this challenge. A proposal was drawn up for a crash program with three main parts: (1) summer visits to the colleges by teams of three expert consultants each--representing administration, faculty/curriculum, and student services--to think through with college staff the present and future role of each college against the background of its own community; (2) a national conference and subsequent regional workshops, during the planning year; and (3) a program of information dissemination--with a specialized newsletter and other publications--to encourage college participation in various government and private programs and activities.

This proposal was submitted to USOE in February, and by late March it had been approved and the funds necessary to carry it on had been set aside in grants to 85 colleges in 12 regional consortia. On April 1 the program was launched. About 80 per cent of the 1968-69 funds (\$473,000 out of a total of \$585,000) were disbursed by the central office at AAJC that year, to expedite the start of the program; only the funds for regional activities were left with the regional coordinators.

Despite the early success of the initial national conference at Airlie House, Virginia, and of the summer of consultant team visits, it was soon apparent that more than a single year's program would be needed if the colleges involved were to be helped substantially. Queried by AAJC in the fall of 1968 as to their views, 96 per cent of the college representatives favored their college's participation in a possible second year of the program, 97 per cent approved faculty in-service training as the focus of the second year, and 98 per cent favored continuation of AAJC as the coordinating agency of a national program.

The seven-person FWDI advisory committee, augmented by the 12 regional coordinators, met and approved a plan for a two-track program the second year--planning and development for a new group of colleges, and faculty development for those continuing into the second year of the program. It was further recommended that both the consulting procedure and the funding be decentralized in the second year, so that the regional coordinators would disburse 80 per cent of the funds instead of 20 per cent; and decisions on regional activities would be left entirely to the regions and their planning committees, with the central office at AAJC functioning as a service and information agency. These suggestions were accepted and incorporated in a consolidated FWDI

proposal to the U.S. Office of Education. The result: about 165 colleges applied for the program, but only the second-year (faculty development) track was funded; 40 of the original 85 colleges were included plus 13 new ones, for a total of 53 colleges funded in eight regional groups. Many colleges in the original 85 were not funded in PWDI because they decided, with AAJC encouragement, that they were ready to go ahead on their own--so they applied as independent consortia. Some of these groups, in Kentucky, Tennessee, Puerto Rico, and other places, are still going strong.

The focus of the 1969-70 program, then, was on faculty and instructional development. The central office (AAJC/PWDI) suggested to the 40 continuing colleges that they select a "principal consultant" to work with in the second year, possibly from the team which had visited them the previous year; most followed this suggestion. The thirteen new colleges were encouraged to pick a team of consultants for an initial planning visit, and names of consultants were suggested. But each of the 53 colleges made its own decision on consultants. During this second year, there was strong emphasis on developing systems of individualized instruction; four bilingual workshops on the systems approach were held.

When the time came to consider a possible third-year extension of the program, AAJC proposed a two-track program, to open the doors to colleges which had qualified for Title III aid by virtue of becoming five years old or achieving accreditation or correspondence status. At the same time, on the advice of the advisory group, an additional year of faculty development was applied for. This time the two-track concept was approved; 40 of the 53 colleges in the 1969-70 program were funded for a second year of faculty development, while 36 new colleges were funded for a year of planning and development. In addition, AAJC was asked to provide special services to three other groups; six colleges on the Mexican-American border, 16 two-year colleges or centers in Puerto Rico, and 11 colleges with independent National Teaching Fellow projects. This made a total of 104 different colleges served in 1970-71.

Because of the complexity of the third-year program, AAJC decided to divide responsibility for administration of the program. Director Selden Menefee continued to be responsible for over-all services, such as publications and consultant advice, as well as for seven regional groups of new colleges in the Planning and Development Project, and the group of six on the Mexican border. Associate Director Shafeek Nader was given responsibility for the eight groups of colleges in their second year of faculty development and the other two special groups. Heavy emphasis was placed on serving disadvantaged and minority groups of students during the third year of operation.

It was believed by fall of 1970 that the principle of rotating colleges through the Program With Developing Institutions, typically (but not always) on a three-year cycle, had been accepted. Accordingly, colleges were encouraged to form functional PWDI groups--re-

gional groups focusing on planning and development for colleges new to the program, faculty and instructional development for those already in--and to apply in such groups. More than 200 colleges did so apply, in more than a score of groups--including some that were quite specialized, such as one group of inner-city colleges. Because of the complexity and heterogeneity of the college groups known to be applying, no consolidated proposal was sent to USOE; it was felt that until the grants were announced, no integrated plan would be possible.

When the grants were announced for the year 1971-72, the two-track, functional groupings had been discarded, and 36 continuing and 38 new colleges were lumped together in eight regional consortia for the regular program, which would focus on "low-income students." In addition, two special groups--the Mexican-American Border and NTF consortia--were again included in the basic funding plan. And six other groups of colleges which had applied for AAJC assistance in the FWDI program were told they were not funded in FWDI, but should instead negotiate with AAJC for special services. (These six groups, including 37 colleges, were assigned by AAJC to a Special Services Project, quite separate from the basic FWDI but supported by the FWDI budget, for negotiation of separate agreements.) Accompanying these awards was the statement referred to in the introduction, in which Dr. Willa Player notified AAJC that this fourth year would be the last in the formal program sponsored by USOE.

A planning meeting of FWDI regional coordinators for the 1971-72 program was held in Washington in May, 1971. Two basic decisions were made: (1) The year's program would be strongly focused on the problems of low-income students, as recommended by the USOE Division of College Support; and (2) no national conference would be held, but instead several multi-regional workshops on programs for low-income students should be organized by the central office. These recommendations were followed, with results as summarized in the chapters to follow.

The story of the program's first three years has been told in detail in three interim reports published by AAJC/FWDI:

Developing Institutions: The Junior College, July 1969;

Faculty Development in the Junior College, August 1970;

Developing Junior/Community Colleges: 1970-71, September 1971.

The present report completes this series.

In all, 200 funded colleges have been served at some time in the four years and three months of the Program With Developing Institutions and another 365 colleges have received marginal services (but no funding) as associates of the program. (The nature of these services will be detailed later.) Thus a total of 565 two-year institutions received some benefits from FWDI during its life span. This number is more than half of the total number of junior/community colleges and technical institutes in the country (1,111 in October, 1971).

II. GENERAL EVALUATION OF THE 1971-72 PROGRAM

As of June 28, 62 of the 68 colleges in the regular Program With Developing Institutions had returned evaluation questionnaires sent to them in early May, giving their experiences with and reactions to the program. Most of those responding were either presidents of the colleges or campus coordinators of the Title III program. They were told that identification of colleges and respondents was optional, but only one respondent chose to remain anonymous. Of the six who had not responded by late June, all were on the West Coast--five in California (Barstow, Humphreys, Shasta, Sierra and Victor Valley Colleges) and one in Oregon (Clatsop Community College). Percentages given for 1971-1972 in this and succeeding chapters are based on the 62 replies received; the final figures by colleges are given in Appendix B of this report. The six colleges in the Mexican-American Border Consortium were not included in the evaluation questionnaire mailing because although all activities of the PWDI were open to them, this group developed its own program along somewhat different lines, and some of the regular PWDI evaluation questions were therefore not applicable.

The key, over-all evaluation of the program was this question: "In general, how valuable has the 1971-72 Program With Developing Institutions been to your College?" Some 68 percent of respondents answered "very valuable," the top rating. This response was remarkably consistent with the responses in the past three years to this same question--all of which varied from 68 to 70 percent "very valuable," as the following table shows:

Q. 1: General value:	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72 (%)
Very valuable	70	68	70	68
Considerable value	25	30	29	27
Some value	5	2	1	5
Little value	-	-	-	-
No value	-	-	-	-

As in previous years, the highest ratings assigned by the evaluators to component parts of the program on this same five-point scale, were given to the following: making it possible for staff members to attend professional meetings; inter-campus visits by staff members; campus workshops; consultant visits to the colleges; regional workshops; and the national newsletter, in that order. Detailed figures will be given in succeeding sections of this report.

AAJC Participation: Another key to the general value placed on the program as coordinated by AAJC was contained in the answer to this question: "Do you think the 1971-72 program would have been equally valuable to your college if AAJC had not participated in it?" Of the 62 replies, 63 percent said "No" and only 11 percent "Yes," with the others marking "Don't know." This was a somewhat lower *After the percentages were calculated for this report on June 28, questionnaires were received from these colleges and are included in the totals in Appendix B.

percentage of "No" replies than were given to comparable questions in previous years, as the following table shows:

Q. "Would program have been as valuable without AAJC participation?"	Percentages:			
	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Yes	0	2	3	11
No	94	89	83	63
Don't know	6	9	14	26

Some of the factors which may have affected the replies to this question are:

(1) There has been a steady, planned decentralization of the program since the first year, intended to encourage regional and local leadership in the solution of local problems. The AAJC/PWDI central office has become less and less the coordinator, more and more the advisor each year.

(2) The 1971-72 central office was operated on a much lower budget than ever before, since the funding was split in two to support separate offices for PWDI and for special services to other groups of colleges, as noted above. The result was operation of the PWDI by a two-person staff--the director and one secretary-assistant--during most of the year. Therefore the variety of central office services was somewhat less than in previous years.

(3) Finally, it was generally known a year ahead of time that 1971-72 was to be the last year of the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions, at least in its present form. Therefore the colleges were already thinking in terms of future consortium programs without AAJC assistance, and many had already submitted applications requesting other assisting agencies (though several of the applications for aid in 1972-73 did still request AAJC assistance).

In view of these considerations, it may be considered surprising that such a high percentage of the respondents affirmed the value of AAJC's participation in the program this year.

III. NATIONAL PWDI WORKSHOPS

The suggestion of USOE officials that the final year of the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions zero in on the problems of the low-income community and junior college student--not only racial or ethnic minorities, but the poor in general--was eagerly accepted by the central staff and regional coordinators of the program. All realized that as the number of students attending college increased, the range of their preparation and ability levels widened. The major brunt of this challenge fell on the community and junior colleges, because most of the "new students" were trooping into the two-year institutions. How to recruit, assist, motivate and communicate with these new students who came from a non-college background was the central problem.

Workshops on the Low-Income Student

It was decided by the regional coordinators in their planning session in May, 1971, that the central office in Washington could best contribute to the total program not by staging one or two large conferences to kick off and keynote the effort at the beginning of the year (one possibility considered by the central office), but by several decentralized workshops on the problems of low-income students, located so that they could be attended by large numbers of faculty and students from member colleges. Accordingly, the 68 basic colleges were queried as to what their problems were in dealing with low-income students, and what topics should be explored to help them develop suitable programs on campus. The results were tabulated, and the top six became the subjects of the sessions at all workshops in the series:

1. Definition of the problems faced
2. Understanding the world of the low-income student
3. Recruiting and testing the "new student"
4. Financial resources for the low-income student
5. Motivation and the problem of under-achievement
6. Developing more effective learning systems

Five host colleges, all with something special to show in the way of programs for low-income and minority students, were invited to cooperate with PWDI in making local arrangements for workshops that were typically bi-regional. The schedule followed was:

Brookdale Community College, Lincroft, N.J., Sept. 30-Oct. 2
Malcolm X College, Chicago, October 14-16
Palmer College, Columbia, S.C., October 28-30
Los Angeles City College, California, November 14-16
Tarrant County Jr. Col. District, Fort Worth, Texas, Nov. 18-20

Because of the large number of topics to be covered, and the preference of the colleges for a two-day workshop to enable a large number of faculty members to attend, a tight schedule was adopted. The general sessions themselves were depended on to supply interaction. (One result: the commonest criticism by participants was that there should have been more small-group sessions to provide greater interchange of views. However, since there was need for a series of general sessions emphasizing innovative special programs to assist the low-income student, a calculated risk was taken and formal opportunities for small-group interaction were not built into the program.) One result was that those attending the smallest workshop, at Fort Worth, gave it the highest evaluation (see below); here, the need for more small-group interaction was not felt.

All member colleges were urged to send teams to these workshops--typically, five or more persons, including two or more faculty members and two or more students. This fact, and the location and make-up of host colleges, resulted in "confrontations" at two workshops. At Malcolm X College, a group of black power militant students invaded one of the meetings; and at Los Angeles, militant Chicano and Black students and young instructors who were representing member and associate colleges turned two of the sessions mainly into "rap sessions" for the expression of their views. This was interesting to some but "turned off" some other college representatives.

In all, over 300 persons attended the five workshops. The cream of the discussion at all five meetings was brought together in a monograph, The Low-Income Student in the Community College: Problems and Programs, (PWDI Publication No. 16, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., March, 1972).

Following were the replies of those actually attending the workshops and returning questionnaires in response to the question "What value do you think this workshop had for you?"

Workshop	Number checking:				
	Very Valuable	Considerable Value	Some Value	Little Value	No Value
Brookdale CC, N.J.	6	13	9	0	0
Malcolm X, Chicago	9	24	6	1	0
Palmer College, S.C.	30	33	22	2	0
Los Angeles City Col.	4	15	13	1	2
Tarrant Co. J.C., Texas	10	9	3	-	-

In the perspective of the total program at the end of the year, the 62 evaluation forms returned showed the following replies (by the representatives of the 56 colleges attending these workshops) to the question "Please evaluate... the PWDI specialized... fall

workshops on programs for the low-income student":

Very valuable	21	(38%)
Considerable value	25	(44%)
Some value	8	(14%)
Little value	2	(4%)
No value	-	-

On the positive side, many of those actually attending the sessions said they had gained new ideas on each of the following topics: methods of recruiting low-income and minority students, setting up developmental programs in which credits can be earned, use of students as peer-group recruiters, counselors and tutors, use of human potential seminars as motivators, and development of government and on-campus aid programs to assist the "new student."

Career Curriculum Workshops

Following the fall series of workshops described above, a questionnaire was sent to the PWDI funded colleges asking about their further needs for workshops. Of 41 colleges replying, 38 expressed interest in sending representatives to workshops on career curriculum building. Accordingly, a cooperative project was undertaken with Kenneth G. Skaggs, coordinator of occupational education projects at the American Association of Junior Colleges, to supply two workshop opportunities to PWDI member and associate colleges in the spring. Central Piedmont Community College in Charlotte, North Carolina, one of the country's most outstanding career education centers, agreed to host the first one, March 23-25; and the Community College of Denver took responsibility for local arrangements on the second. The \$20 registration fees supplied enough revenue above expenses to permit publication of a short monograph bringing together some of the discussion at both workshops, Career Curriculum Building in the Community College (PWDI Publication No. 18, American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C., June, 1972).

Co-sponsoring the Denver workshop with AAJC were WICHE (the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education) and the Colorado State Board for Community Colleges and Occupational Education.

Of those attending the two workshops who returned evaluation forms in the final sessions, over two thirds said the meetings had been "very valuable" or of "considerable value." Following is the distribution in numbers (and percentages):

<u>Ratings given:</u>	<u>Number by workshops:</u>	
	<u>Charlotte</u>	<u>Denver</u>
Very valuable	13 } 77%	6 } 66%
Considerable value	14 }	23 }
Some value	7	15
Little value	1	-
No value	-	-

- 9 -

Asked what ideas they would take away from the workshop they attended, the respondents mentioned especially often: individualizing instruction, the core curriculum and how to implement it, the ladder-lattice approach, open entry, and multiple options. Demonstrations were presented by practising teachers at both workshops, six in Charlotte and four in Denver.

In the perspective of the total program, the 34 (out of 62) colleges responding at the end of the year whose representatives had attended one of the two Career Curriculum Building workshops evaluated them as follows: 10 (29%) very valuable, 19 (56%) considerable value, 5 (15%) some value, and none lower.

IV. REPORTS ON REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

Each of the eight regional coordinators in the 1971-72 program was asked to prepare for this report a brief summary of regionally-directed activities during the year. The major regional activities in each region included program planning, fiscal coordination, and conducting of regional workshops on topics of special interest to the colleges in the group. Following are the summary reports from the eight regional coordinators:

1. Northeast Region

The 1971-72 Title III FWDI group in the Northeast FWDI Region included the previously funded colleges--Quinsigamond (Mass.), Cape Cod (Mass.), and Norwalk (Conn.) which were joined by four new colleges--Butler County (Pa.), Housatonic (Conn.), Maria Regina (N.Y.), and Villa Maria (N.Y.). The newly funded colleges utilized their funds for planning activities including consultants, inter-campus travel, local workshops, inservice training and orientation.

The highlight of the year was the First Annual Region One Conference on Instructional Improvement held April 26-28 at Quinsigamond Community College in Worcester, Massachusetts. The conference program featured Dr. Michael Brick of Teachers College, Columbia University; an interdisciplinary workshop on New Approaches to Teaching conducted by "Total Effect: Resources for Education" of New York; topic-oriented workshops utilizing such people as Dr. Ken Blanchard, University of Massachusetts, on the Administrator's Role in Contemporary Education; Selden Menefee of AAJC on Federal Funding; Professor Robert Prior on Audio-Tutorial Biology; and a slide-telephone-lecture presentation from the University of Massachusetts conducted by Dean Joseph Marcus and Professor Al Wandrei of Quinsigamond.

The conference climaxed a successful year, bringing together consortium members and offering a rewarding diversity of educational philosophy from which to draw. The conference was low-key, as was the entire regional operation, but results can be obtained without rigid structure as long as the participants are willing.

--Gordon MacPhee, Regional Coordinator

2. Carolinas Region

The Carolinas Consortium, coordinated by Palmer College at Charleston, S.C., had the following objectives:

1. Two consortium-wide workshops of three days duration were planned by special committees of institutional coordinators. These workshops were held in October, 1971 at Columbia, South Carolina and in April, 1972 at Myrtle Beach, South Carolina. Both activities were well attended by both consortium and associate members.

The thrust of the fall workshop was how to deal with low-income and marginally-prepared students. Outstanding speakers and reactors from South Carolina and the Southeast made excellent presentations dealing with the world of the low-income student, recruiting and testing the new student, and financial resources available to the low-income student. It was evident from the high attendance at this workshop (160 paid attendants) that educators throughout the Carolinas and the South are particularly interested in dealing with the "new student" and endeavoring to find ways to motivate him to succeed in their institutions.

The Myrtle Beach workshop's thrust was to develop behavioral objectives and individualized instruction to meet the needs of the student. Selected faculty members demonstrated to small groups what they had accomplished through individualized instruction on their campuses during the past year. A strong emphasis was placed on tests and measurements, in order that the college might identify the level at which students should enter the programs. The spring workshop involved 300 faculty and staff members from consortium and associate member colleges.

2. Widespread use of consultants by individual institutions and groups of colleges has brought about modification of college calendars, greater flexibility of schedules, improvement of grading systems, development of behavioral and instructional objectives, and curriculum revision and development. The approach has been through involvement of faculty; development of sophisticated attitudes to academic innovation on the part of individual teachers; creation, purchasing, and sharing of teaching materials; and development of more effective learning techniques; all through cooperation between teachers and colleges.

Inter-campus visits to observe and evaluate promising experiments and to study established programs have been widespread. In cooperation with the American Association of Junior Colleges' Program With Developing Institutions, groundwork has been laid, the attention of the faculty has been caught, and these institutions now plan on creating new learning experiences, changing timeworn policies and procedures, and developing within their institutions a learning environment in which all students can be successful.

--Charles Palmer, Regional Coordinator

3. Florida Region

Besides participating in the multi-regional workshop on "The Low-Income Student: Problems and Programs," held at Columbia, S.C., October 29-30, the four colleges in this group attended two regional conferences.

Each college sent seven faculty members to a workshop on media and instructional development, at Florida State University, February

23-25. Demonstrations gave instructors from the colleges actual experience in preparing film and sound presentations, including slide and video-tape segments. The participants also had a chance to sample computer-assisted instruction packages.

The second regional workshop was on Human Potential Seminars, with James McHolland of Kendall College as the chief consultant. This was held April 3-5 at Polk Junior College at Winter Haven, with W.F. Taylor as coordinator, and was attended by ten persons from each member college, with an additional 20 spaces reserved for representatives of associate colleges. There was a very positive reaction to this workshop on the part of those attending.

--Harvey Sharron, Regional Coordinator

4. North Border Region

The North Border Region has had, in addition to local conferences, two general workshops, the first on individualized instruction and the second on community services. The workshop on Individualized Instruction and the Use of Media was held on the Suomi campus and included presentations from outstanding persons, including Dr. Marie Martin, Director of Community College Education, U.S. Office of Education, on "New Concepts in Instruction"; Alton L. Raygor, Coordinator of Reading and Study Skills Center, University of Minnesota, on "English/Communications"; Arthur D. Schmidt, National Laboratory for Higher Education, Durham, North Carolina, on "Social Sciences"; and R.N. Hurst, Purdue University, Indiana, on "Natural Sciences." The 150 persons in attendance had the opportunity to review programmed and individualized instructional materials from the main publishers of the country and observe a demonstration of these materials by Mrs. Sarah See, Manager, College Publications, Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Palo Alto, California.

An outstanding spring workshop on Community Services was held at Mesabi State Junior College, Virginia, Minnesota, in mid-April, with about 60 persons in attendance. Presentations included these: J.K. Hvistendahl, Iowa State University, on "Knowing Your Community - Constituency Studies"; Selden Menefee, Director, AAJC Program With Developing Institutions, on "Community Services - The AAJC Perspective"; Gunder A. Myran, Michigan State University, on "Community Services-- Process vs Program"; Harvey K. Jacobson, University of North Dakota, on "Communications Techniques and Your Public"; Clemens Wisch, Dean of Community Services, Milwaukee Technical College, on "Adult Education for All"; and Bruce Bauer, Director of Community Services, North Hennepin State Junior College, on "Senior Citizens on Campus." The conference touched some of the theoretical aspects of communications and public relations, as well as the practical applications on several campuses of the consortium and elsewhere.

--Ralph Jalkanen, Regional Coordinator

5. Midwest Region

Because of the wide geographical distribution of the colleges in the Midwest Region, it was decided in planning meetings in June 1971 to sponsor only limited activities on a regional basis. The colleges were encouraged to attend conferences in other regions in any areas of interest to them. The majority of the colleges were not new to the program and these elected to spend most of their money on faculty travel and for consultants to their individual campuses.

The one conference officially sponsored by the region was held at Minneapolis, Minnesota on November 7-9, 1971 with the theme of "The Rural Low Income Student." The 68 persons from five states who registered were almost unanimous in rating the conference of considerable value to them. The participants were awakened to some of the needs among the poor and minority groups in the midwest and for the most part were challenged to do something at their own schools for them.

This conference was a natural follow-up of three other conferences held earlier in the fall in the midwest, but not under the sponsorship of this region. Colleges in this region were well represented at these conferences at Suomi College (on systems development), Malcolm X College (the national workshop on the low-income student), and the University of Nebraska.

The annual state spring meeting of the community colleges of Iowa focused on "Non-Traditional Education" largely as a result of earlier efforts to set up a regional conference on this topic.

Also as a result of regional activities, 18 two-year colleges in Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota and Missouri filed an application for Title III funds for 1972-73 to further explore the rural low income student.

The colleges in this region have benefited greatly because of activities made possible by the AAJC/PWDI. Evaluation sheets recently submitted by participating colleges are evidence of the value of the program but oral testimonials by representatives of many of the colleges are even more complimentary to and appreciative of the program.

--James Loper, Regional Coordinator

6. Plains Region

The Plains Region FWDI consortium consisted of eight public and private community colleges located in Nebraska and Kansas during the current year. All of the colleges participated actively in the regional meetings. In addition, each of the colleges developed and carried out active programs on its own campus during the year.

The regional meetings opened with the one on "The Low Income Student in the Community Junior College," September 27-28, 1971. The con-

ference was very helpful to all participants in developing a greater concern as to the problems and frustrations that students and potential students have in this area of concern from our lower income families. Since the "Low Income Student" was one of the major themes for the year, this probably helped develop a much greater concern on each of our college campuses for greater involvement in working with and recruiting students from the low-income bracket.

The second regional conference was on the campus of Colby Community College, November 8-9, on the "Human Relations Seminar." This conference was the second one in our region for "Human Relations" and many of the participants were attending this as an advanced seminar. Fourteen different colleges participated in this conference. All of the colleges attending involved a number of their students in this seminar. From all of the various reports coming back from students attending, they found this to be very educational and informative for their own personal needs and for the helping of other students on their own campuses. The consultants for this regional conference were: Clete Hinton, James D. McHolland, Dorothy L. Magett, Louise P. Mills, Liam Rooney, Roy W. Trueblood, Marjorie van der Veen, Sixanne Imes, and Richard S. Ferris.

The Colby workshop had the largest attendance of the year for all member colleges and non-member colleges. At this conference, we made a great stride forward by involving students side-by-side with professional teaching and administrative staff members. This developed a much closer relationship between the student and teacher than usually prevails on our college campuses.

"Learning Strategies" was the theme for our final regional conference, on the campus of Pratt Community College, March 27-28, 1972. Our consultants were: Carroll Londoner, Wilber Tewes, Herman L. Glaess, Charles W. Dull and Ronald D. Stakslev. The conference was helpful in showing how to develop better learning strategies for our students and how the faculty might accomplish these goals more effectively. At this conference we had more students attending than faculty members. The faculty members found themselves playing a different role than they have previously, by having more students involved this time. Dr. Emerson Beets of the Kansas City Regional Office of the Department of HEW participated actively, and was greatly impressed with the quality of the conference and by the very active participation by the students. The great student involvement was the highlight of the conference. The students suggested the active involvement of students at our future meetings and on-campus workshops.

All of the regional colleges had workshops, seminars, consultant visits, inter-campus visits, etc. On their own campuses they have found that the funding through Title III permits each college to do a more effective job in improving the quality of instruction and of inservice training for faculty members. Outstanding consultants in the various administrative and teaching areas have been very helpful in

the up-grading of individual faculty efforts.

The self-image and community image of each of the participating community colleges has improved considerably with the strides we are making in up-grading the quality of our instructional programs.

--Orville P. Kliewer, Regional Coordinator

7. California Region

The California consortium of thirteen developing community colleges has held four workshops to implement its approved project.

The first general workshop was held at Mt. San Jacinto College, October 15 and 16, 1971, for the purpose of learning first-hand how Mt. San Jacinto was operating individualized instruction programs for low-income students and others in the areas of secretarial science, auto mechanics, and health education. Approximately 120 teachers and administrators from the thirteen colleges attended the two-day workshop. Many of the instructors saw for the first time the possibility of using various types of media to provide programmed instruction.

Most of the colleges were represented at the western multi-regional workshop on programs for the low-income student, arranged by the FWDI Washington office and held in Los Angeles, November 14-16, 1971.

The second regional workshop was held at Gavilan College on January 21 and 22, 1972, for the purpose of reviewing counseling techniques and curriculum development for the low-income student. This was also a two-day workshop in which approximately 90 instructors from the thirteen colleges learned of various counseling techniques that proved successful with low-income students. The workshop also included sessions on developing new media approaches for use in individualized instruction.

The third regional workshop was held at the University of California in Berkeley, and was a two-day workshop in which 85 instructors had first-hand experiences with the use of computers as an instructional tool. Sessions were also held on personalized systems of instruction by Dr. J.G. Sherman, Department of Psychology, Georgetown University; Dr. Ben Green, Educational Research Center, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Dr. Robert Karplus, Department of Physics, University of California, Berkeley.

All of the workshops provided the participants with new concepts and ideas for individualized instruction for low-income students.

The next step will be to involve the instructors who participated in the 1971-72 workshops in re-organizing and revitalizing their courses for the low-income students. Courses will be converted to individualized instruction so that students may proceed through the courses at their own pace.

--Ralph Schroder, Regional Coordinator

8. Oregon Region

The purpose of the Oregon consortium in 1971-72 was to bring members of the faculty and staff of each of the four participating institutions to greater awareness of the needs of minority and low-income students; and further, to provide planning resources for the implementation of programs designed to better serve the needs of culturally different and low-income people.

Consortium-wide activities included a two-day workshop at Bend in September focusing on problems of these special groups of students, with participants attending from each of the four colleges in Oregon. The workshop was considered to be a success by the participants, and sent back to each institution a cadre of well-informed and committed people to carry out the objectives of the Consortium.

In addition, deans of instruction and deans of students have met throughout the year to exchange information regarding the special efforts in each institution for the purpose of improving communication and implementation of programs serving the target population.

Evidence of the success of this year's effort is to be found in the greatly expanded efforts planned for the 1972-73 academic year in several of the participating institutions.

--David Habura, Regional Coordinator

Regional Workshops

In addition to the multi-regional workshops sponsored by the national office, all of the eight PWDI regions scheduled workshops of their own. These usually were attended by all funded colleges in the region, and by many associate colleges as well (at their own expense). The above reports from coordinators describe these workshops. Nearly all of them were directly related to meeting the problems of low-income and minority students.

In general, the regional workshops were well appreciated and received high ratings. "Very valuable" was the rating assigned to them by 31 of the 55 persons answering, percentagewise a much better rating than regional conferences and workshops had received in previous years:

<u>Regional Workshop Evaluations</u>	<u>Percentages:</u>			
	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>1969-70</u>	<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
Very valuable	43	31	37	56
Considerable value	42	61	47	44
Some Value	14	8	15	-
Little value	1	-	-	-
No value	-	-	-	-

From these ratings, two things are apparent: (1) the expertise of the regional coordinators and local colleges in planning workshops has increased greatly during the last three years; and (2) the workshops this year, focused on low-income students, were very useful.

V. PUBLICATIONS

In 1971-72, as in previous years, the backbone of the PWDI information program was the newsletter Developing Junior Colleges, designed to provide quick communication to the colleges about programs, funding, workshops and other matters. Until this year it had been published about twice a month, on an irregular basis as needed, and disseminated to all requesting it. But certain changes were made in the distribution in the final year of the program. In preceding years, funded colleges had been given bundles of newsletters for circulation to all full-time staff members if they so requested. As a result, the circulation reached a peak of about 6,000 copies in 1970-71.

In the final year of the program, because of a drastic cut in the budget for publications, and because experiments had shown that third-class mail could not be depended on for quick delivery to the colleges, several changes were made in the newsletter operation. Bundles were cut out, and replaced by a smaller number of individual copies, as many as were needed for funded colleges; the more than 450 associate colleges were limited to one free copy each; and most others on the mailing list were notified that they would have to subscribe and cover extra mailing and printing costs (\$2.50 a year) if their copies were to continue. About a thousand individuals not covered by the program did subscribe, but the reduction in bundles cut the circulation of the newsletter to about 2,000 near the beginning of the final year and 2,200 at the end. First-class mail was used exclusively.

The second change was to convert the newsletter from about two a month to one a month, while doubling its size, from four to eight pages, which could be sent for the same price (eight cents for one ounce). The schedule was still kept flexible, to meet the needs for quick communication; but 12 issues were published in 1971-72. The last one, No.105 in the four-year series, was dated May 25, 1972.

The new eight-page format gave new flexibility in space, and opportunity to use more feature materials about the colleges and their successful innovations. But perhaps because of the lower circulation and less frequent distribution, the evaluation ratings accorded the newsletter dropped slightly from the previous year (though five out of six respondents still gave it one of the two top ratings on the five point scale):

Evaluation of Newsletter	1968-69	Percentages:		
		1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Very valuable	72	53	58	50
Considerable value	26	34	29	34
Some value	2	11	13	16
Little value	-	2	-	-
No value	-	-	-	-

During the year, many unsolicited letters were received expressing appreciation for the information relayed on a time basis through the newsletter. Arthur M. Cohen, Director of the Eric Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges at UCLA, wrote:...."I continue to be impressed with your Developing Junior Colleges newsletter. I find it the most informative and easily read publication of this type. And I need not add that dozens of this type come across my desk every week. Thanks for this service. Please let us know any time we can be of assistance to you in providing background information."

And at the end of the year, when discontinuance of the newsletter was announced, many letters were received expressing the hope that AAJC would continue at least the function of communicating funding deadlines, program opportunities and workshops available, as the newsletter had done for over four years.

Other Publications

Besides sending a kit of 16 key publications to each college new to FWDI at the beginning of the year, the central FWDI office sent to all funded colleges occasional publications obtained from sources outside AAJC. These included The E.D.O. (Education Development Officer), National Laboratory for Higher Education; Directions and Designs for the 70's, a publication of the Two-year College Student Development Center of New York; The President's Report, an outstanding publication of its type by Robert Lahti of William Rainey Harper College, Illinois; a very useful brief memo on proposal writing by consultant David N. Thompson; and several USOE publications on federal programs and the availability of federal funds.

The Program With Developing Institutions itself issued the following publications to member and associate colleges:

- Directory of FWDI Associate Colleges for the current year, August 1971
- Developing Junior/Community Colleges: 1970-71 (A third interim report on FWDI), FWDI Publication No. 15, Sept. 1971
- The Low-Income Student in the Community College: Problems and Programs, FWDI Publication No. 16, March 1972
- Directory of Consultants and Advisors, Fourth edition, FWDI Publication No. 17, April 1972
- Career Curriculum Building in the Community College, FWDI Publication No. 18, June 1972 (in press).

This final report is No. 19 on the FWDI list, not including revisions of the Directory of Associate Colleges.

VI. CAMPUS ACTIVITIES EVALUATED

As noted in Chapter II, the highest ratings for segments of the Program With Developing Institutions went to some of the activities initiated on the individual campuses. Portions of the modest Title III grants were budgeted for on-campus consultants, local workshops, inter-campus visits and attendance of staff at professional meetings, and these expenditures were usually controlled by the campus FWDI coordinator or committee. Since lack of funds budgeted for these purposes is common among developing institutions, even a little money that could be used by local initiative for such things provided relief from frustration, as the following evaluations show:

Local Workshops

Of the first 62 colleges reporting, 45 had held on-campus workshops apart from those conducted for the region. Usually they imported one or more consultants for this purpose. The 45 colleges reporting such workshops evaluated them as follows:

Very valuable- - - - 80%
Considerable value- - -16%
Some value- - - - - 4%

This was the first year this question was asked, as there had been less emphasis on this aspect of the program in previous years.

Inter-Campus Visits

Of the first 62 colleges reporting, 59 had sent one or more staff members on inter-campus visits, an activity always encouraged by the program. Of these, 78 per cent gave this activity a "Very valuable" rating, an even higher percentage than in the preceding two years when the same question was asked:

Evaluation of Inter-Campus Visits	Percentages:		
	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72
Very valuable	72	77	78
Considerable value	21	17	19
Some value	7	6	3
(None lower)			

Professional Meetings

The highest rated activity of the whole program was the funding of "meetings attended by staff members who would not otherwise have been able to go." These were, typically, professional meetings and workshops. Every one of the colleges reported some activity in this sector, and 82 per cent rated it as "Very valuable." Again, a comparison was possible with the two preceding years:

- 20 -

<u>Evaluation of Meetings attended:</u>	<u>1969-70</u>	<u>Percentages:</u>	
		<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
Very valuable	79	85	82
Considerable value	19	14	16
Some value	2	1	2
(None lower)			

The consistently high evaluation given this activity is impressive.

Consultants' Visits

Maintenance of a panel of qualified consultants available to the colleges was from the beginning in 1968 a major responsibility of the FWDI Washington office. Not only was the list of consultants constantly revised and updated, and new names added on the basis of recommendations from the field and high ratings by the colleges using them, but each year a revision of the directory has been published for the use of college and AAJC officials. The current directory, published in April 1972, contains the names of 650 consultants, after those who did not respond to the request for updating their vitas had been eliminated. This figure includes the names of AAJC staff members as advisors. A majority of the consultants used were those nominated by the FWDI central office to meet needs specified by the colleges.

In 1971-72, of the 62 colleges first reporting, 55 had used consultants on campus (and others were planning to do so with funds for the current year). Of the 55, almost 64 per cent rated their consultant's visits to their campuses "Very valuable," a somewhat higher percentage than in previous years:

<u>Evaluation of Consultants</u>	<u>1968-69</u>	<u>Percentages:</u>		
		<u>1969-70</u>	<u>1970-71</u>	<u>1971-72</u>
Very valuable	47	51	49	64
Considerable value	44	41	44	29
Some value	9	6	7	7
Little value	-	2	-	-
No value	-	-	-	-

The colleges made their own decisions on which consultants to invite, but most made use of the FWDI consultant directory, and many telephoned the central office for detailed advice. If consultants not on the FWDI panel were invited and received top ratings on the consultant forms which were supplied by the central office, and if this was an area of consultation in which a wider geographical spread was needed, the highly-rated consultants were invited to join the panel.

VII. COLLEGE COMMENTS

Perhaps the best insight into the value of the 1971-72 program is provided by this question, asked of each college in the evaluation questionnaire: "Please state which aspect(s) of the 1971-72 Program With Developing Institutions has been most valuable to you, and cite in narrative form your most interesting and significant experience(s) with the program." Following are the responses of the individual college people most deeply involved, one from each of the 62 colleges replying, identified by college if they had no objection (identification was optional). Those who did not identify themselves are presented anonymously, along with others in the same region.

1. Northeast Region

Our faculty have been concentrating on developing new classroom approaches so they have gained considerably from workshops and inter-campus visits. We have excellent consultants and everyone gained from sharing in the Regional Conference on April 26-28. The low-income student workshop held by FWDI at Brookdale Community College, New Jersey, opened the eyes of people who attended and helped start the year off successfully. Several local workshops were also conducted, with concentration on particular areas such as nursing and allied health programs. The psychology and humanities faculties have spent much of their free time making our developing institutions program a success.

--Quinsigamond Community College, Mass.

Consultants who have come to our campus have stimulated the thinking of our faculty and administrators, have promoted planning and development, and have helped to generate new programs. The most immediate and specific outcome has been the development of a program to teach English as a second language.

--Housatonic Community College, Conn.

Local workshops--and the Human Potential Seminar (under direction of Kendall College personnel).

--Norwalk Community College, Conn.

The FWDI grant was a tremendous boon to Maria Regina College. The theme for our activities for the 1971-72 year was "Development," with special emphasis on the FWDI grant. It was extremely important to have the grant because all constituencies of the college took part and enjoyed the benefits thereof. The bringing of experts on campus was the most satisfying experience, since the entire faculty was able to meet the consultants and to discuss problems of faculty in various areas. This has raised faculty morale....The attendance of representatives from our college at FWDI workshops was almost an equal advantage. We rate as a most significant experience for our College our representation at the Innovative Institute held in Honolulu, Hawaii. The visit of Selden Menefee during our regular faculty orientation program last fall and the ongoing correspondence with him, Dr. Walter Graham,

and Gordon MacPhee linked us with other recipients of the grant and the operation of the program. We now have confidence that we are moving in the right direction.

--Maria Regina College, N.Y.

The faculty conferences on campus with consultants were a valuable addition to our Faculty and Institutional Development Program. Each consultant was selected for a definite purpose: Stuart Steiner on developmental programs; Eileen Kuhns on modular scheduling; Wesley M. Westerberg on human potential seminars; J.K. Cumiskey on community services; and J. Paul Melanson on institutional research. Each provided invaluable assistance to both administration and faculty, and an impetus to action.

--Villa Maria College, N.Y.

Most valuable: opportunities for local conferences and projects, wherein a large number of our people could become involved.

--Butler County Community College, Penn.

2. Carolinas Region

The opportunity for faculty members to visit other colleges, attend workshops and have subject area consultants visit campus.

--Palmer College at Columbia, S.C.

Our most valuable activity by far has been our involvement in the human potential program. The workshop on campus, and visits to Kendall College by some faculty members, have resulted in considerable interest in this, and implementation of the program in our college.

--Surry Community College, N.C.

We have found that consultants' visits to our campus and the meetings we could not have attended without the aid of FWDI funds to be our most helpful experiences. These afforded us opportunities to bring in people to evaluate our situations and opportunities to go to professional meetings where they would see the latest in materials and hear of new techniques. Between sessions, discussions with other people attending were of great help.

--North Greenville College, S.C.

Faculty attendance at consortium workshops brought faculty members together. As a result, visitation to other campuses was made. The workshop activities, and observation of new programs in progress, were valuable experiences for our faculty.

--Coastal Carolina Community College, N.C.

The most valuable asset to us, of our participation in the FWDI, has been the broadening of interest and concern among our faculty because of the varieties of contacts with other colleges and faculties made possible by this program.

--Montreat-Anderson College, N.C.

The 1971-72 AAJC Program With Developing Institutions was of considerable value to Richmond Technical Institute. While the advantages have been many, there have been some disadvantages, chiefly the inability to schedule all the meetings, trips, etc., that were felt desirable because our faculty and staff normally operate under a full schedule with additional events sometimes impossible to arrange. However, many advantages have accrued to Richmond Tech in the development of a remedial program. Through an agreement with Learning Institute of North Carolina, we have learned what remedial problems confronted other schools within our state and what solutions were tried. This established rapport with sister institutions and broadened our thinking in the remedial field. Both faculty and staff now feel confident that the dropout rate can be definitely reduced at Richmond Tech because of information gathered through the PWDI program, and we are planning to initiate a new program.

--Richmond Technical Institute, N.C.

This program has opened the eyes and minds of our staff and faculty as to the critical needs in these areas: socio-economically deprived students; low-income students; and academically deprived and under-achievers. It has brought about many changes in attitude with regard to these needs. The exposure brought about through consultants, workshops, seminars and off-campus visits has created a desire for change--a desire to move more rapidly into the behavioral objectives approach and the systems approach to instruction. This Title III grant has done more to up-date our staff and faculty than any of our past efforts.

--Florence-Darlington TEC, S.C.

All workshops sponsored by the consortium have been attended by four or more members from this institution, one meeting by eleven. Getting our teachers to participate in these workshops has been a real morale builder. In addition to that, they have definitely profited from the meetings. We have had one on-campus workshop in which our total faculty and administrative staff have been involved. This particular experience was especially profitable and we anticipate having more of this nature. Without PWDI funding it would not have been possible.

--Forsyth Technical Institute, N.C.

The staff at AAJC has been extremely helpful in assisting our school by suggesting consultants, by publishing many helpful articles in the newsletter and by giving individual advice when needed. Also, they helped the regional coordinator develop meaningful conferences--problems were discussed at these meetings that were relevant to all the schools present, and many of the workshops were staffed by local school officials who were able to help isolate problems and develop good group discussions on how these problems could be solved. The locations of the conferences were well selected and they provided a perfect setting for group interaction. They gave our administrative and instructional staff the opportunity to know each other better and to discuss the development of our school in a relaxed atmosphere....Our regional coordinator, Dr. Charles Palmer, and his staff were of great benefit to us.

Never did we call upon them for advice and assistance that that they did not respond in a very positive manner. By working with men of Dr. Palmer's caliber, AAJC/PWDI has done an outstanding job and has a very good reputation throughout the country....The inter-campus visits made by our administrative and instructional staff were very stimulating and helped us considerably in developing new ideas. Also, the consultants invited to Greenville TEC thoroughly evaluated our programs and gave many concrete suggestions for improvement.

--Greenville TEC, S.C.

The most significant experience we have had has been the local workshop on individualized instruction held by the National Laboratory for Higher Education. This resulted in changed attitudes of approximately 50% of the instructional staff. Several have already made changes in instructional methodology and others have selected packaging of materials for a summer objective. This interaction was the culmination of over a year's preparation of the faculty to move to individualized instruction.

--Beaufort County Technical Institute, N.C.

This entire program has been very valuable in training our faculty to develop individualized instructional materials. We feel the workshop conducted by the NLHE on campus was the key feature of our successful program.

--Piedmont Technical Education Center, S.C.

Visits to campuses, workshops, etc. by faculty. The Myrtle Beach workshop involved more of our staff than any other activity. Several speakers were outstanding (Dr. E.B. Moore for example).

--York Technical Education Center, S.C.

Workshops held on campus using consultants were most beneficial because the entire faculty participated. In-depth visits to other campuses were very meaningful, dialogue with other administration and faculty members helped considerably in overcoming problems in changing to self-paced instruction. Regional workshops aided considerably. Ideas presented by consultants were pragmatic in nature and could be implemented in our institution.... In short, PWDI has given us tremendous opportunities that we otherwise wouldn't have had.

--Spartanburg TEC, S.C.

The most valuable aspect of the 1971-72 Program With Developing Institutions were: (1) the evaluation of the consulting team during the fall of 1971; and (2) the Systems Instructional workshop held at our campus in the spring of 1972. This workshop was presented by the National Laboratory for Higher Education of Durham, N.C. Twenty-nine faculty members participated in this workshop.

--Midlands TEC, S.C.

3. Florida Region

It is difficult to single out a single experience of the program

as the most outstanding since almost all of the activities were quite different in scope and purpose. I think the real value of the program has been the variety of experience and the resultant exposure to multiple ideas, problems, and solutions. In terms of real value, the measurement will only come with an evaluation of our local program and the determination of its effectiveness with the low-income student, a process that will take place this fall or coming spring.

--Seminole Junior College, Fla.

The three meetings in which our division participated were as follows: (1) Columbia, S.C.--rated by faculty participants as interesting, worthwhile, constructive. (2) The Tallahassee meeting in February got an enthusiastic evaluation by faculty participants, and the results will be applied in classroom work. (3) The Winter Haven human potential seminar was a refreshing demonstration of a valuable technique, which will prevade our thinking and action for a long time. These meetings were all "very valuable."

--Edison Community College, Fla.

(1) Exposure to the Human Potential Seminar approach of a group of Faculty; (2) opportunity to have consultants on campus; (3) opportunity for travel and "exposure" to new ideas; and (4) work of the local FWDI committee.

--Polk Community College, Fla.

4. North Border Region

Faculty development--keeping on top of new techniques in educational technology. The most significant experience was in hosting a conference on our campus and finding out from visitors where we were "with it" or not as far as our involvement goes. The contacts made with other people, the face exchange of needs and achievements would have to rank high.

--Suomi College, Mich.

The most valuable aspect of the 1971-72 FWDI program has been the opportunity for faculty members to visit other institutions and gather ideas for use in their classrooms. It is my hope that this part of the program will always continue.

--Bay de Noc Community College, Mich.

The most valuable program was the fall meeting on individualized instruction, with many excellent speakers and many people participating.

--Hibbing State Junior College, Minn.

The regional workshops were of much value; however, having the flexibility to schedule and conduct comprehensive studies of the area served by this college should also prove to be a major benefit to the college and the community.

--Mesabi State Junior College, Minn.

The most important part of our involvement has come through giving our faculty an opportunity to view first hand the exciting programs and innovations occurring on other campuses. In the fall of '71 there appeared to be little interest in changing traditional ways on this campus. For the most part, courses were taught in a manner not very different from the style of 1922 when the college was founded. Although we have had no instant transformation in one year, there are encouraging signs of experimentation with mini-courses, individualized instruction, and audio-tutorial methods. Questioning of traditional ways is now occurring on this campus.

--Vermilion State Junior College, Minn.

5. Midwest Region

We have made significant use of FWDI funds to improve instruction on our campus. Perhaps the most significant overall result has been in the development of more and better aids for individualized instruction. We now have audio-tutorial teaching in our science labs, elementary math courses, and engineering drawing. We still have much work to do, but we are making much progress in other areas also.

--Muscatine Community College, Iowa

This institution has profited greatly from the Developing Institutions Program. Perhaps the most significant experience this year was a three day in-service workshop, planned by a faculty committee, while students were on their spring break. The program follows. First day: "We Look at Others," (Faculty had visited 15 institutions in seven states, with specific goals set for the visitation.) Second day: "We Look at Our Community," (Exploration with representatives of the community served.) Third day: "We Look at Ourselves," (A bit of introspection involving representatives of faculty, students, administration and governing board.)

--Marshalltown Community College, Iowa

The AAJC/FWDI enabled our faculty to attend state, regional and national meetings not otherwise possible.

--Iowa Lakes Community College, Iowa

Our association with the AAJC Program With Developing Institutions has been the best kind of Federal support Iowa Central has ever received. The regional workshops have been of special help in acquainting the faculty and administration with new and different approaches to instruction. Inter-campus visits to see programs in other colleges have been beneficial to faculty and staff, enabling them to view innovative practices which when adopted will result in improved instruction at Iowa Central. The newsletter has always been informative and interesting; it has been especially useful in keeping us current concerning dates of regional meetings and closing dates of Federal applications. In addition to this vital information, reports on other colleges are interesting. Perhaps the most stimulating experiences have resulted from consultant visits to our campus. The faculty have ac-

cepted new ideas, and have sincerely attempted to integrate these ideas into their own personal instructional approach.

--Iowa Central Community College, Iowa

The chance for faculty members to visit other colleges, and to attend workshops and meetings which they normally wouldn't be able to do.

--Willmar State Junior College, Minn.

Title III has provided us with an opportunity to hire consultants and for faculty travel previously unavailable. This has brought new vigor to a college severely isolated geographically.

--Worthington State Junior College, Minn.

The most significant aspect has been the faculty visits to other campuses. Without these funds worthwhile trips would not have been possible. Secondly, the regional workshops were beneficial to all.

--Anonymous

The three most valuable aspects of the AAJC/PWDI Program for 1971-72 for Southwestern Michigan College were the consultant visits, inter-campus visits by staff, and meetings attended by staff who would not have been able to attend. Specifically: (1) As a young institution with limited resources, Southwestern Michigan College is still growing and changing rapidly in response to local needs and attempting to change structure to meet those needs. Two critical areas received much help from consultants: the Student Services Division and the English Department. In Student Services the college needed assistance in reorganizing the division to serve more adequately the low-income students, through financial aids, recruitment, and placement. In the English Department, assistance was needed in systematizing instruction so that the varied needs of all students (especially the disadvantaged) could be met. (2) The faculty at Southwestern Michigan College generally has no more than three years of experience in higher education. Many faculty members had not been on the campus of more than one or two other community colleges in their lives. There were no regular college funds for this purpose; but thanks to PWDI, before the year is over most faculty members will have had the opportunity to visit at least two other colleges, and spend time with their counterparts discussing common problems and possible solutions. (3) The college has previously allowed \$25 per faculty member per year to attend regional and national professional meetings. Obviously, this is not enough to allow for much of the needed stimulation, advance in discipline knowledge, and awareness of educational technique change that can come from these meetings. This year the effects of attending these meetings have been felt on campus, and will continue to be felt in a most positive way.

--Southwestern Michigan College, Mich.

Attendance of faculty and staff at meetings and workshops off campus was a valuable aspect of the 1971-72 Program With Developing Institutions. Participation in PWDI enabled us to take advantage of opportunities to promote faculty growth and bring new ideas to campus

which otherwise we would have had to bypass. I believe, however, that two April workshops on our campus, one on the General Studies Program conducted by Gerald Lichti of Hesston College, and one on Individualized Instruction conducted by Dr. Barton Herrscher, were the most valuable FWDI experience for us this year. These workshops, which correlated well, were relevant to our curriculum planning and were excellent in-service educational experiences for our faculty.

--Presentation College, S.D.

6. Plains Region

The three workshops on Low-Income Students, Human Potential, and Learning Strategies, coupled with our own local workshop, made a valuable learning experience for us. We were also very pleased with the inter-campus visits; our faculty found many new ideas of benefit to our students.

--Colby Community College, Kansas

The AAJC/FWDI program has been helpful in many ways. The regional meetings were developed with a common theme and all colleges could attend and benefit. The program has also enabled members to attend conferences in their field of interest....Our greatest problem is securing the services of consultants....Over-all, the program is great and we would hate to be without it. Many thanks to AAJC for all the help.

--Fort Scott Community College, Kansas

The regional workshops were of extreme value, giving us the opportunity to establish groundwork which provided a basis for future work. I cite especially the workshop which helped both faculty and students better understand motivation, and the workshop which established a basis for human relations. These workshops furnished common elements so that progress could be made....Visits to other campuses have also been especially valuable, providing an opportunity to see at first hand successful new programs and practices.

--Pratt Community Junior College, Kansas

All aspects of the program this year have been equally valuable; especially the consultants and workshops. But probably the most significant experience was the development of our long range plans which combined the efforts of the administration, faculty, consultants, and other personnel interested in the college into a cohesive force for the betterment of the college.

--Highland Community Junior College, Kansas

One of the most valuable aspects of the program this year was the opportunity for faculty to attend professional meetings and workshops. This contact with other schools and professors was of considerable help.

--Hesston College, Kansas

This question is like asking a person to decide between two or more delicious foods. I believe our faculty was stimulated tremendously

by their increased participation in professional meetings and the PWDI consortium-sponsored seminars. The immediate decision-making stimulus, however, came from the consultants we brought to our campus. They applied their efforts directly to our situation and our wishes. We were able to visualize what will be needed to expand our curriculum. These consultants also helped us to see that expansion will make demands upon our budget and time....Of these three programs, the consultant program will probably have to be rated highest in terms of results.

--York College, Nebraska

The human potential seminar workshop at Colby, Kansas, was a learning experience for participants as far as their own personalities were concerned, plus educating them with techniques that could be applied with small groups of students. A workbook based upon these principles was purchased, and the techniques are now being applied to some of our classes at Nebraska Western College....Four faculty members also attended the workshop on "The Low-Income Student" at Hesston, Kansas. This provided an opportunity to discuss strategies for attracting and holding these students in traditional and innovative higher education programs....The workshop on New Curricular Approaches to Occupational Education at Denver, Colorado, in May, provided us with insights in how to implement new occupational curriculum on campus; this was the most valuable aspect of the workshop. Individual contacts with other workshop participants provided many new ideas for our vocational program.

--Nebraska Western College, Nebraska

7. California Region

Gavilan College found the following experiences most interesting and significant: (1) Visitations to the other campuses and the contacts made by Gavilan teachers with those having the same interest on other campuses; (2) the inspiration gained by our faculty in seeing the results of individualized instruction for low-income students, at the Mt. San Jacinto workshop in October; (3) the opportunity to host a conference on curriculum development and consulting for the low-income students on our own campus; (4) experience in writing behavioral objectives for programmed instruction; (5) the valuable information received from the consultants who visited the Gavilan campus; (6) the workshop held by AAJC/PWDI on the problems of low-income and minority students.

--Gavilan College, Calif.

Our most significant experiences have been taking members of our faculty to meetings, conferences and visits to other campuses to study ways to assist low-income students. This has been done through trips to study curriculum and special techniques and methods used to help students who are either bilingual or come from low-income backgrounds. Some of the conferences that we have attended were those held at Mt. San Jacinto College on October 15-16; Los Angeles City College, November 14-15; Gavilan College, January 21-22; Berkeley, March 3-4; and two trips that were taken by the entire College Curriculum Committee to

visit San Francisco City College and Hartnell College to learn more about vocational education programs on February 7, and to visit Golden West College and El Camino College, April 17 to find ways of developing multi-media types of instruction and special study centers for low-income students. In addition, representatives from Cuesta College attended an AAJC-sponsored conference in Nebraska to study the role of the community college in rural areas. We are also planning to attend the Career Education Conference in Denver the first week of May and are sending six representatives to Ontario to a Human Motivation Conference on May 12-14, 1972. Without consortium funds, these trips and experiences would not have been possible. We feel that we have learned much and have been able to update and keep up with what is being done through these experiences.

--Cuesta College, Calif.

The most important aspect for us was being able to permit our staff to go on all professional growth trips they were interested in. We brought in one consultant with good results. The most significant experiences were the workshops at Berkeley, Mt. San Jacinto, and Gavilan College.

--Palo Verde College, Calif.

Our most valuable aspect has been the opportunity to go from performance objectives to course building to programmed or individualized instruction. We have several programs ready for 1972-73 college year as a result of three years in consortiums. We have more interested faculty ready to learn for next year. As a direct result, we were able to: (1) Identify course objectives in performance goals; (2) visit campuses and workshops and decide upon "media" for individualized instruction; (3) plan courses for individualized instruction for all levels of students--low-income, minority, etc.; (4) plan a budget to implement these courses; and (5) schedule and offer several courses for September 1972 in foreign languages, home economics, auto shop, shorthand, and drama.

--College of the Siskiyous, Calif.

For Mt. San Jacinto College, the most significant experiences from the Developing Institutions Program have been the following: (1) working with other similar institutions on development of multi-media; (2) development by our teachers of measurable objectives, putting these into a publication and sharing them with other institutions; (3) having our teachers develop precise grading criteria, putting them into a booklet and sharing them with other institutions; (4) our relationship with other schools with similar problems in attempting to solve the problem of disadvantaged students with low motivation by bringing in consultants from a distant college; and (5) providing our teachers with opportunities to attend conferences and to visit schools where programs for disadvantaged are being conducted. (6) The availability of Selden Menefee of AAJC Developing Colleges to provide consultation concerning the availability of consultants, and lists of appropriate institutions for our teachers to visit, has been invaluable.

--Mt. San Jacinto College, Calif.

Having some money to encourage faculty experimentation, visits to other campuses, and attendance at workshops with colleagues in fellow consortium colleges.

--Yuba College, Calif.

8. Oregon Region

The opportunity to plan and develop a comprehensive program for Native American students.

--Central Oregon Community College, Oregon

The most significant aspect of the 1971-72 PWDI program from our point of view has been the contact with other institutions. The benefit from association(s) with other professional educators, on both an informal and formal basis, is difficult to measure. (We would also like to see the newsletter continued.)

--Blue Mountain Community College, Oregon

Planning and development, with a broad representative focus.

--Southwestern Oregon Community College, Oregon

VIII. SERVICES TO ASSOCIATE COLLEGES

One of the multiplier effects of this type of extensive program is that if the door is kept open, benefits to some types may be extended to colleges outside the funded groups. In the first year of the program the decision was made, with the approval of the USOE Division of College Support, to extend marginal benefits (but no funding of course) to colleges requesting associate status in PWDI. It was believed that a score or more of colleges which had inquired about this would be included in this category. They were to be given the newsletter Developing Junior Colleges without charge, other publications available free or at low cost, invitations to participate in national and regional workshops and conferences at their own expense, and such staff aid as could be made available incidentally without interfering with services to funded colleges.

To the amazement of all concerned, the associate college list had grown to 200 in the first year of the program, and continued to grow--to 321 at the end of the second year, 441 in June 1971, and 491 when the program ended in June, 1972. Most of these colleges were added because of individual requests from those concerned. Many of them were not eligible, or not funded, under Title III. (Some were ineligible for Title III aid because they were less than five years old, or not accredited or in process; others were not funded because they were not among the most needy.) Colleges which had been funded earlier in PWDI, or had applied for the program, but were not currently funded, were automatically included in the associate list if they so desired, which further swelled the number.

During 1971-72 because of the limited budget for the basic program and the larger number of associate colleges, free distribution of the newsletter and other publications was limited to one copy per associate college. Approximately 150 associate colleges participated in regional or multi-regional workshops, at their own expense; and about 50 telephoned or wrote to the PWDI Washington office for assistance in identifying and recommending consultants, or information on appropriate funding agencies, and deadlines, and other matters. Every effort was made to assist associate colleges requesting such aid.

By the end of the year 1971-72, the PWDI director had visited not only 69 of the 74 colleges currently funded in the program, but also more than a score of associate colleges during the final year, incidental to other college visits.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

The significance of the Program With Developing Institutions over a period of four years, from April 1, 1968 to June 30, 1972, may be summarized as follows:

(1) FWDI has provided special services to 200 colleges funded at one time or another in the basic program, and this has led nearly all of them to adopt modern practices and successful innovations in the fields of administration, faculty in-service training, curriculum development, individualized instruction, the use of multi-media techniques, and/or improved student services, all at a relatively modest cost per institution.

(2) It has demonstrated the value of using a non-profit educational association as an assisting agency, to spread the benefits of a federal program to a maximum number of colleges at minimum cost.

(3) It has provided a bridge between the U.S. Office of Education and the colleges, especially in bringing two or more federal programs together in a single institution or group of colleges in mutually reinforcing relationships. (For example, the program has promoted attendance of member colleges at EPDA (Education Professions Development Act) institutes, by encouraging the use of Title III funds to pay faculty travel costs to such training sessions; also it informed colleges of funding opportunities of all types.)

(4) It has actively promoted the organization of regional consortia, wherein developing institutions with similar needs could cooperate for their mutual advantage not only to seek funding but to share experiences and successful innovative practices.

(5) Finally, FWDI has been useful to the American Association of Junior Colleges in building communications bridges with more than 500 two-year colleges and technical institutes, and making AAJC resources better known and more readily available to these institutions.

The types of cooperative relationships built up in this program, involving USOE, funded colleges, and AAJC, could well provide a model for other programs of extensive aid to schools and colleges in the future.

--S.M.

APPENDIX A: LIST OF COLLEGES FUNDED IN THE
PROGRAM WITH DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS, 1971-72

Following are the funded colleges participating in regional groups
served by the Program With Developing Institutions in 1971-72:

1971-72 PWDI REGIONAL GROUPS:

Northeast

Quinsigamond CC, Worcester, Mass. 01605*
Butler County CC, Butler, Pa. 18001
Cape Cod CC, W. Barnstable, Mass. 02668
Housatonic CC, Stratford, Conn. 06457
Marie Regina C, Syracuse, N.Y. 13208
Norwalk CC, Norwalk, Conn. 06854
Villa Maria C, Buffalo, N.Y. 14225

Carolinas

Palmer College, Charleston, S.C. 29401*
Beaufort Co. Tech. Inst., Washington, N.C. 27889
Coastal Carolina CC, Jacksonville, N.C. 28540
Florence Darlington TEC, Florence, S.C. 29501
Forsyth Tech. Inst., Winston-Salem, N.C. 27103
Greenville TEC, Greenville, S.C. 29606
Midlands TEC, Columbia, S.C. 29205
Montreat-Anderson C, Montreat, N.C. 27657
N. Greenville JC, Tigerville, S.C. 29688
Palmer C, Columbia, S.C. 29201
Piedmont TEC, Greenwood, S.C. 29646
Richmond Tech. Inst., Hamlet, N.C. 28345
Spartanburg Co. TEC, Spartanburg, S.C. 29303
Surry CC, Dobson, N.C. 27017
York Co. TEC, Rock Hill, S.C. 29730

Florida

Santa Fe JC, Gainesville, Fla. 32601*
Edison JC, Fort Myers, Fla. 33901
Polk JC, Winter Haven, Fla. 33880
Seminole JC, Sanford, Fla. 32771

North Border

Suomi College, Hancock, Mich. 49930*
Bay de Noc CC, Escanaba, Mich. 49829
Gogebic CC, Ironwood, Mich. 49938
Hibbing State JC, Hibbing, Minn. 55746
Mesabi State JC, Virginia, Minn. 55792
Vermilion State JC, Ely, Minn. 55731

Midwest

Muscatine CC, Muscatine, Ia. 52761*
Anoka-Ramsey State JC, Coon Rapids, Minn. 55433
Iowa Central CC, Fort Dodge, Ia. 50501
Iowa Lakes CC, Estherville, Ia. 51334
Marshalltown CC, Marshalltown, Ia. 50158
Presentation C, Aberdeen, S.C. 57401
St. Mary's C, O'Fallon, Mo. 63366
Southwestern Michigan C, Dowagiac, Mich. 49047
Washtenaw CC, Ann Arbor, Mich. 48107
Willmar State JC, Willmar, Minn. 56201
Worthington State JC, Worthington, Minn. 56187

Plains

Dodge City CC, Dodge City, Ks. 67801*
Colby CC, Colby, Ks. 67701
Fort Scott CJC, Fort Scott, Ks. 66701
Hesston C, Hesston, Ks. 67062
Highland CJC, Highland, Ks. 66035
Nebraska Western C, Scottsbluff, Neb. 69361
Pratt CJC, Pratt, Ks. 67124
York College, York, Neb. 68467

California

Gavilan College, Gilroy, Calif. 95020*
Barstow College, Barstow, Calif. 92311
College of the Siskiyous, Weed, Calif. 96094
Cuesta College, San Luis Obispo, Calif. 93401
Humphreys College, Stockton, Calif. 95207
Lassen College, Susanville, Calif. 96130
Mt. San Jacinto C, Gilman Hot Springs, Calif. 92340
Napa College, Napa, Calif. 94558
Palo Verde College, Blythe, Calif. 92225
Shasta College, Redding, Calif. 96001
Sierra College, Rocklin, Calif. 95677
Victor Valley C, Victorville, Calif. 92392
Yuba College, Marysville, Calif. 95901

Oregon

Central Oregon CC, Bend, Ore. 97701*
Blue Mountain CC, Pendleton, Ore. 97801
Clatsop CC, Astoria, Ore. 97103
Southwestern Ore. CC, Coos Bay, Ore. 97420

Mexican-American Border Consortium

Texas Southmost C, Brownsville, Tex. 78520*
Arizona Western College, Yuma, Ariz. 85634
Cochise College, Douglas, Ariz. 85607
Imperial Valley Coll., Imperial, Calif. 92251
Laredo JC, Laredo, Tex. 78040
Southwestern Coll., Chula Vista, Calif. 92010

*designates coordinating institution

The list of 491 associate colleges is available through AAJC.

APPENDIX B--EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESULTS

EVALUATION BY COLLEGES

(N=64)

We request the college president or program coordinator at each funded FWDI college fill out this form, in triplicate, and return the original to AAJC/PWDI, One Dupont Circle, N.W., #410, Washington, D.C. 20036, with copies to the regional coordinator and for your file.

1. In general, how valuable has the 1971-72 AAJC Program With Developing Institutions been to your college?
Very valuable 43 Considerable value 18 Some value 3 Little value - No value -

(Please now evaluate the following component parts of this year's program:)

2. FWDI specialized multi-regional workshops (check only if someone from your college attended):
- a. Fall workshops on programs for the "low-income student" (N.A.)
Very valuable 22 Considerable value 26 Some value 8 Little value 2 No value - (6)
- b. Spring workshops on career curriculum building:
Very valuable 10 Considerable value 20 Some value 5 Little value - No value - (29)
3. Workshops and conferences sponsored by the regional FWDI consortium:
Very valuable 32 Considerable value 25 Some value - Little value - No value - (7)
4. Local workshops (if any held on your campus with FWDI funds):
Very valuable 37 Considerable value 8 Some value 2 Little value - No value - (17)
5. The newsletter (Developing Junior Colleges):
Very valuable 31 Considerable value 23 Some value 10 Little value - No value -
6. Inter-campus visits to see programs in other colleges:
Very valuable 48 Considerable value 11 Some value 2 Little value - No value - (3)
7. Meetings attended by staff members who would not otherwise have been able to go:
Very valuable 52 Considerable value 11 Some value 1 Little value - No value -
8. Consultants' visits to the campus (in general):
Very valuable 36 Considerable value 16 Some value 5 Little value - No value - (7)
9. Do you think the 1971-72 program would have been equally valuable to your college if AAJC had not participated in it?
Yes 7 No 40 Don't know 17
10. Please state which aspect(s) of the 1971-72 Program With Developing Institutions has been most valuable to you, and cite in narrative form your most interesting and significant experience(s) with the program. (Continue on other side if necessary)

(Identification optional)

Date _____ Person replying _____
College _____
Town & State _____

(4-72)

APPENDIX C--EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS,
AAJC PROGRAM WITH DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
July 1, 1971 through May 31, 1972

	<u>Expenditures to 5/31/72</u>	<u>1971-72 Budget</u>
Salaries, Taxes and Benefits	\$ 36,402.	\$ 35,470.
Travel	4,149.	4,000.
Office Supplies & Expenses	5,436.	4,000.
Consultants	261.	2,000.
Publications	5,245.*	9,000.
Administrative Services	<u>11,880.</u>	<u>11,880.</u>
	\$ 63,373.	\$ 66,350
Total Expenses		

*Does not include publications in May and June, 1972.